



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/041,570

01/10/2002

Andrew Myers

23452-149

5211

909

7590

04/05/2006

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2194

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/041,570

Applicant(s)

MYERS, ANDREW

Examiner

VAN H. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed January 11, 2006. Claims 1-28 are currently presented in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Sanghvi et al.** (Pub. No.: US 2002/0010804 A1).

4. **As to claim 1:**

Sanghvi teaches the invention as claimed including a system for providing notification of events in a unified communications services network (*see the Abstract and paras. 0007-0011*) the system comprising:

- (i) a network that provides unified communications services to users that enable the users to share information, the unified communications services comprising application processes (*see fig.1 and the event providers, event consumers discussion beginning at para. 0026*);

- (ii) an event filter in communication with an event generating application process, wherein the event filter performs a first level filtering of notification of an event generated by the event generating application process (*see the event filters discussion beginning at para. 0008 and para 0052*);
- (iii) an event manager that receives the notification of the event from the event filter over the network , and disperses the event over the network (*see fig. 4 and event transformer discussion beginning at para. 0039*); and
- (iv) a notification handler that receives the notification of the event (*see event notification discussion beginning at paras. 0026, 0029, 0035, 0036, and 0054*).

5. **As to claim 2:**

Sanghvi teaches the first level filtering is performed based on an event type of the event (*see the event filtering and event type discussion beginning at para. 0049*).

6. **As to claim 3:**

Sanghvi teaches the first level filtering is performed based on a priority level for the event (*see the priority level discussion beginning at para. 0055*).

7. **As to claim 4:**

Sanghvi teaches a plurality of event generating application processes and a plurality of notification handlers registering of the plurality of notification handlers (*see paras. 0049-0050*) a registration manager that manages the registration of the plurality of notification

handlers, and provides awareness of registered notification handlers to at least one of the plurality of event generating application processes (*see the registry discussion beginning at para. 0034*).

8. **As to claim 5:**

Sanghvi teaches the registration manager maintains a list of currently registered notification handlers in a shared memory and wherein the plurality of event generating application processes may query the list of currently registered notification handlers (*see paras. 0030-0036*).

9. **As to claim 6:**

Sanghvi teaches the notification handler performs a second level filtering of notification of the event (*see fig.4 and the second event filters discussion beginning at para. 0047*).

10. **As to claim 25:**

Sanghvi teaches the notification handler performs the second level filtering of notification of the event by determining whether contents of the event meet second level filtering criteria established by a subscriber, and communicating the event to the subscriber if the contents of the event meet the second level filtering criteria associated with the subscriber (*see fig.4 and the multi-level event filtering discussion beginning at para. 0047*).

11. **As to claims 7- 12 and 26:**

Note the rejection of claims 1-6, and 25 above. Claims 7-12, and 26 are the same as claims 1- 6 and 25, except claims 7- 12 and 26 are method claims and claims 1- 6 and 25 are system claims.

12. As to claims 13-18 and 27:

They include the same limitations as claims 1-6 and 25 above, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

13. As to claims 19-24 and 28:

Note the rejection of claims 1-6 and 25 above. Claims 19-24 and 28 are the same as claims 1-6 and 25, except claims 19-24, and 28 are processor readable medium claims and claims 1-6 and 25 are system claims.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed January 11, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

15. Applicant argues in substance that in Sanghvi, the event transformer is not the same as an event manager that receives the notification of the event from the event filter over the network, and disperses the event over the network.

16. In response, Sanghvi's teaching "multiple events 304 are received by an event filter 306, which applies various filter criteria 310 to determine which of the received events are passed through the filter to an event transformer 308... The distributed event 500 is generated by, for example, the event transformer 308 in FIG. 4. The distributed event 500 includes standard header 502, which contains multiple header parameters... All "on the fly" processing of events, such as filtering, forwarding, routing, logging and notifying, can

Art Unit: 2194

be based on the header information” (see paras.0039-0054) meets the limitation as claimed.

Conclusion

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

18. Any inquiry or a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: (571) 272-2100.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571) 272-3765. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM 6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, WILLIAM THOMSON can be reached at (571) 272-3718.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Art Unit: 2194

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for patents

P O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Van H. Nguyen


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER